REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the patent application. All of the claims stand rejected.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract for language considerations. Applicants submit amendments to the Specification herein, including an amended abstract. The amended abstract provides the necessary punctuation and deletes text in order to ensure that the Abstract does not exceed a total length of 150 words.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Fowlow; Claims 2-9 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over the teachings of Fowlow in view of Powers; Claims 10-13, and 15 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the teachings of Fowlow in view of Wallace; Claims 14, and 24-26 as being unpatentable over Fowlow in view of Powers, Wallace and Perlman; Claim 16 as unpatentable over Fowlow in view of Powers and DiGiorgio; Claims 17-23 and 27-30 as being unpatentable over DiGiorgio in view of Fowlow; and, Claims 24-26 as being unpatentable over DiGiorgio in view of Fowlow and Perlman. Based on the amendments to the claim language, and for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

Most of the claims rejections under 102 and 103 are premised on the applicability of the teachings of the Fowlow patent. The

Fowlow patent is directed to a system and method for using a distributed object system to find and download Java applications. Under the Fowlow system, a client obtains the name of a base class, queries a naming service to determine which class server contains the needed base class, requests the code for the base class from the class server, and then retrieves the code either by reading the file locally or by repeating the process to locate and read the code. The Fowlow patent does not teach or suggest that a client has a token comprising a unique identifying attribute which the client uses for communicating with a data processing device for obtaining applications, as is expressly recited in all of the pending claims. Under the Fowlow process, a client may know the class name (see: Col. 13, lines 3-5) but does not have any unique information to use in obtaining access to an application. The Fowlow client undertakes a multi-step process by which the client finds the class server and obtains the code for the base class. The Fowlow client does not, however, have any identifying information which uniquely represents client access to the code and which interacts with a data processing device for obtaining the code. The Fowlow class name is not the same as nor suggestive of the unique identifying attribute, each unique application identifying attribute being provided to call up at least one software comprising at least one of an application identified by the unique application identifying attribute and software components to form the

application of the present invention and there is no other teaching in Fowlow which is analogous to the claimed token.

Under the present invention, the user has a token comprising the unique identifying attribute, preferably on a chip card, whereby the token uniquely identifies the application and whereby the token communicates with the data processing device. All of the pending claims expressly recite the token and use thereof for configuring applications. In contrast, the Fowlow system and method assumes that a client has the class name and does not require any access verification or authentication, let alone by a unique token which can communicate with other entities.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Fowlow patent does not anticipate or obviate the invention as claimed. For a patent to anticipate another invention under 35 USC § 102(b), the patent must clearly teach each and every claimed feature of the anticipated invention. Since the Fowlow patent clearly does not teach the claimed token and use thereof, it cannot be maintained that the Fowlow patent anticipates each and every claim feature of Claim 1.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully aver that the Fowlow patent teaches away from the use of a unique token, since Fowlow teaches that an object will give the client the name of a class needed for the application, with no restrictions (Col. 13, lines 3-5), and the client can then make queries and requests directly to servers, again without any authentication or access

verification. Clearly such unrestrained access is not the same as or suggestive of a system wherein a unique token is provided to a particular user for identifying and communicating with data processing devices in order to configure applications for that user. Applicants have reviewed the cited teachings in the Fowlow patent and respectfully conclude that Fowlow does not teach or suggest the unique access and communication token as claimed.

The remaining claims rejections are predicated on the DiGiorgio patent. The DiGiorgio patent is directed to a secure access token device whereby a user is authenticated using the token device. While DiGiorgio uses the token to establish user access, it does not provide a unique identifying attribute, each unique application identifying attribute being provided to call up at least one software comprising at least one of an application identified by the unique application identifying attribute and software components to form the application. Since the claims, as amended, all recite the unique identifying attribute of the application, Applicants respectfully assert that the DiGiorgio patent does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

Moreover, Applicants have reviewed the additionally cited Wallace, Powers, and Perlman patents and respectfully conclude that none of the cited patents provide the teachings which are missing from the Fowlow and DiGiorgio patents. Specifically, none of the cited patents teaches or suggests that a user have a

token comprising a unique identifying attribute for establishing access to applications and for communicating with a data processing device to configure applications. Absent some teaching or suggestion of the claim features of the independent claims, it cannot be concluded that the independent claims are anticipated or obviated by the cited art. Accordingly, the claims which depend therefrom and add limitations thereto cannot be anticipated or obviated by the cited art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, withdrawal of the rejections, and issuance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

U. Hansmann, et al

By: Anne Vachon Dougherty

Anne Vachon Dougherty
Registration No. 30,374
Tel. (914) 962-5910